

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

T.C./A.U. RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS/ARGUMENTS

JUL 12 2007

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 and 22-28 are pending in this application.

Independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended to delete the term "topically applied" and substitute the term "extruded onto" in the first instance. Support for extrusion can be found throughout the specification and particularly at page 20, lines 5-6, for example.

Dependent claims 10 and 25 have also been amended to delete the term "topically applied".

Turning to the grounds for rejection, claims 1, 3-17 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is asserted that the term "topically applied" is new matter. Without addressing the merits of this rejection, the term "topically applied" has been replaced with "extruded onto". Accordingly this basis for rejection is overcome.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. It is asserted that the term "topically applied" is not supported by the specification. However, this basis for rejection has been overcome by the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated and thus unpatentable over USPN 6,887,348 to Hermans. As previously argued, while Hermans et al. teaches the application of polysiloxane to a web, such as by spraying or by printing while the web is still wet after formation, Hermans et al. does not disclose applying a plurality of extruded chemical additive filaments to the web as now claimed. Therefore Hermans et al. does not anticipate the subject matter of the claims as amended.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance. Also, attention is drawn to withdrawn claim 2, which has also

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
T.C./A.U. 1731

been amended consistent with the amendments to claim 1. Claim 1 is generic to claim 2 and therefore claim 2 should also be allowable. In particular, "a single ply web" as recited in claim 1 is generic to "an uncreped throughdried single ply tissue web" as recited in claim 2. Also, "a Fuzz-On-Edge about 1.8 mm/mm or greater" as recited in claim 1 is generic to "a Fuzz-On-Edge about 2.0 mm/mm or greater" as recited in claim 2. Therefore it is requested that claim 2 also be allowed.

Please charge any prosecutorial fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (920) 721-3616.

Respectfully submitted,
CLAYTON C. TROXELL ET AL.

By: Gregory E. Croft

Gregory E. Croft
Registration No. 27,542